

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal: psmtec GmbH (Illertissen, Germany)

Details of the proceedings before EUIPO

Applicant for the trade mark at issue: Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal

Trade mark at issue: EU figurative mark SEVEN SEVEN 7 — Application No 18 123 915

Proceedings before EUIPO: Opposition proceedings

Contested decision: Decision of the Second Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 26 April 2022 in Case R 1498/2021-2

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision;
- uphold the opposition in its entirety;
- refuse the EU trade mark application No 18 123 915 for ‘SEVEN SEVEN 7’ in respect of all of the contested goods in Class 9, namely ‘Software for games on video devices; Game software; Electronic game software; Software’;
- order EUIPO to pay the costs.

Plea in law

- Infringement of Article 47(2) of Regulation (EU) 2017/1001 of the European Parliament and of the Council.

Action brought on 5 July 2022 — Hasbro v EUIPO — Kreativni dogadaji (DRINKOPOLY)

(Case T-413/22)

(2022/C 318/59)

Language in which the application was lodged: English

Parties

Applicant: Hasbro, Inc. (Pawtucket, Rhode Island, United States) (represented by: A. von Mühlendahl and H. Hartwig, lawyers)

Defendant: European Union Intellectual Property Office (EUIPO)

Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal: Kreativni dogadaji d.o.o. (Zagreb, Croatia)

Details of the proceedings before EUIPO

Proprietor of the trade mark at issue: Other party to the proceedings before the Board of Appeal

Trade mark at issue: International registration designating the European Union in respect of the figurative DRINKOPOLY mark — International registration designating the European Union No 1 062 463

Procedure before EUIPO: Opposition proceedings

Contested decision: Decision of the Second Board of Appeal of EUIPO of 8 April 2022 in Case R 596/2017-2

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should:

- annul the contested decision;
- order EUIPO and the other party, should it intervene in these proceedings, to bear the costs.

Plea in law

- Infringement of Article 8 of Council Regulation (EC) No 207/2009.

Action brought on 6 July 2022 — Colombani v EEAS

(Case T-414/22)

(2022/C 318/60)

Language of the case: French

Parties

Applicant: Jean-Marc Colombani (Auderghem, Belgium) (represented by: N. de Montigny, lawyer)

Defendant: European External Action Service (EEAS)

Form of order sought

The applicant claims that the Court should

- annul the decision of 13 October 2021 of the Director for Human Resources providing the applicant with a series of censored CVs that were misrepresented as corresponding to the commitment undertaken by the EEAS as part of the agreement of 9 February 2021;
- annul the agreement made on 9 February 2021 in Case T-507/20 for lack of consent and failure by the EEAS to observe its terms;
- annul, in so far as is necessary, the decision of 29 March 2022 of the Director-General of Resources Management of the EEAS rejecting complaint R/618/21 of the applicant made against the non-performance of one of the essential terms of the agreement made on 9 February 2021 in Case T-507/20 which provided that the EEAS was to provide the applicant with 'the elements linked to the qualifications and professional experience of the candidates regarded by the pre-selection panel as best corresponding to the pre-selection criteria for a set of procedures specified by the agreement';
- order the defendant to pay the costs.

Pleas in law and main arguments

In support of the action against the decision concerning the request for access to documents, the applicant relies on four pleas in law.

1. First plea in law, alleging an error of law in the interpretation of the concept of personal data and in the interpretation of Regulations 2018/1725 ⁽¹⁾ and 1049/2001, ⁽²⁾ misuse of powers and an interpretation of Article 6 of Annex III to the Staff Regulations of Officials of the European Union ('the Staff Regulations') which is incompatible with the provisions of those regulations.
2. Second plea in law, alleging non-compliance with Article 52 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union, infringement of Article 45 of Regulation 2018/1725 in that the limitation on the access to information infringes the principles of sound administration, right to a fair trial, equality of arms, right to an effective remedy and prevents any judicial review of the acts at issue.